

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-10 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview conducted on July 13, 2005 between the Examiner and Applicant's representative Thomas Krul during which a draft of the present amendment and arguments in favor of patentability were discussed. The Examiner indicated that additional review concerning the limitations of the claimed first and second adhesive layer anisotropic conductive adhesive agent as further differentiated during the interview would be conducted, including the possibility of additional search if required.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,042,894). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states "With regards to the limitation that the first adhesive layer and second adhesive layer are formed of the same material.....", Applicant notes no such limitation is provided in either Claim 6 or Claim 7.

As previously noted by Applicants, Goto discloses only a single adhesive layer having conductive particles contacting both of two opposed groups of electrodes.

Goto does not disclose first and second adhesive layers or disclose how the first and second adhesive layers are oriented with respect to first and second terminals. Goto does not disclose a boundary between the first and second adhesive layers as shown in Figures 8A and 8B. Goto therefore does not disclose an anisotropic conductive adhesive agent for electrically connecting first and second terminals, the second terminal being thicker than the first, the first adhesive layer adapted for application to the first terminals, and the second adhesive layer adapted for application to the second terminals. Goto therefore cannot anticipate either Claim 6 or Claim 7. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of Claims 6 and 7.

Claims 1 and 3-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (U.S. Pat. No. 4,696,764). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states "With regards to the limitation that the first adhesive layer and second adhesive layer are formed of the same material, the Examiner takes the position that such a limitation simply implies that the anisotropic material of the claimed invention is simply an adhesive layer containing electrically conductive particles and the product of the claimed invention is the same as that disclosed in the above reference".

Yamazaki discloses only a single adhesive layer contacting both of two opposed groups of electrodes having electrically conductive particles dispersed randomly within the layer. See Figure 2.

Yamazaki does not disclose first and second adhesive layers or disclose how the first and second adhesive layers are oriented with respect to first and second terminals.

Yamazaki does not disclose a boundary between the first and second adhesive layers clearly differentiating the first and second adhesive layers, as shown in Applicant's Figures 1, 8A and 8B. Yamazaki also does not disclose:

- the second adhesive layer is thicker than the first adhesive layer;
- the first adhesive layer adapted for application to the first terminals; and
- the second adhesive layer adapted for application to the second terminals.

Yamazaki therefore cannot anticipate Claims 1, 6, or 7. Because Claims 3-5 depend from Claim 1, Yamazaki cannot anticipate Claims 3-5 for the same reasons. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 6 and 7.

Yamazaki does not disclose a boundary between first and second adhesive layers clearly differentiating a first from a second adhesive layer and as shown in Applicant's Figures 1, 8A and 8B. Yamazaki does not disclose first and second adhesive layers having a plurality of electrically conductive particles dispersed within the first adhesive layer. Yamazaki does not disclose the second adhesive layer is thicker than the first adhesive layer (Claims 8,9). Yamazaki does not disclose the first adhesive layer is specifically oriented toward first terminals and the second adhesive layer is specifically oriented toward second terminals (Claim 10).

Yamazaki therefore cannot anticipate Claims 8, 9 or 10. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claims 8-10.

Applicant notes that the interface or boundary between layers of adhesive of the present invention would be clearly visible under observation such as by using an electron microscope before pressure bonding the two layers. The use of two independently applied layers of adhesive differentiates the present invention from either the Goto or Yamazake references. Various additional claim limitations such as adapting individual layers for application to specific ones of the terminals, the specific placement of the electrically conductive particles in the first layer, and having the second adhesive layer being thicker than the first adhesive layer further distinguish the present invention from either the Goto or Yamazake references.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 15, 2005

By:



G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/TJK/mmk